Developing Risk Management And Outcome-Based Performance Based Monitoring Strategies for the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement

Joseph F. Ryan, Ph.D.
Pace University

Chairman Christopher Shays and members of the Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats, and International Relations, thank you for inviting me to testify.

In your invitation you indicated that the hearing seeks to examine how the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement's (ICE) resources can be used more effectively and cohesively in the interest of national security. You requested that I give my expertise on the application of risk management and outcome-based performance monitoring in the interest of national security.

In the interest of national security I will provide testimony that supports the implementation of risk management and outcome-based performance monitoring as a way of helping ICE to achieve mutually agreed upon goals, which will permit their resources to be used more effectively.

You also asked that I offer recommendations specific to the Bureau. Your letter referred to recommendations made in a GAO report entitled *Homeland Security: Better Management Practices Could Enhance DHS's Ability to Allocate Investigative Resources.* Since I was not given access to the GAO recommendations, my recommendations are not necessarily specific to ICE, but can apply to any government agency.

Introduction

In preparing my testimony I offer a bibliography containing references mostly to outcome-based performance monitoring, or performance measures. Literature dealing with risk management is still largely in the private sector, with scant attention being given to it in the public sector, other than information relating to emergency management related issues.

This might be attributed to the notion that the role of the law enforcement community is to deal with risks, especially crime. Therefore, they may take it for granted that everything they do is aimed at dealing with risks, although most of it is acknowledged to be reactive manner.

It might be overly simplistic to state that the private sector is more successful in recognizing risks than the public sector, there is one driving motive

that forces the private sector to face risks – profits. Businesses by nature are more focused on goal achievement and avoidance of risk simply because it translates to protecting ones monetary assets.

In teaching courses on management and conferring with colleagues who teach in various business schools, it is clear that if the private sector failed to recognize risks, they would have to face their loses and potentially go out of business. In teaching public sector management I have found that the public sector can change by experimenting with what I've labeled as the "Bloomberg Model."

This model is based on the current Mayor of the City of New York, Michael Bloomberg, who brings to city government expertise from his successful private enterprises. While it is hard to assess whether he is truly changing the way government operates, it is clear that in his efforts to change the city's Board of Education, any progress in changing an entrenched bureaucracy can be considered a success.[1]

One of Mayor Bloomberg's unique management strategies is his office, or lack of an office. Both his office and that of his Board of Education consists of open areas where staff sit in open cubicles. The goal is to ensure that all working efforts are interrelated and can be observed and heard, thus facilitating a team approach to getting things done.

I am not necessarily convinced that this is an endorsable public sector strategy, it is reflective of strategies that require involvement of key stakeholders in setting and achieving goals. This will be a key theme for both my discussions of risk management and outcome-based monitoring strategies.

My testimony will emphasize the need for government agencies to recognize risks relevant to their vision and mission, and then follow by addressing the concomitant need for outcome-based productivity monitoring. The later part is the instrument that will help the agency know if they are achieving their mission, and avoiding agreed upon risks. I will begin my discussion with what I consider the simplistic approach to risk assessment and management. It is a logical process in which the stakeholders in any agency can easily identify the risk(s).

Risk Management

The Carnegie Mellon Institute offers a broad definition of risk management. They define it as

> the management of the environment and nuclear risks, those technology-generated macro-risks that appear to threaten our existence. To bankers and financial officers, it is the sophisticated use of such techniques as currency hedging and interest rate swaps. To insurance buyers and

sellers it is coordination of insurable risks and the reduction of insurance costs. To hospital administrators it may mean 'quality insurance.' To safety professionals it is reducing accidents and injuries.[2]

From these various perspectives on risk management, the preferred definition of risk for use in this testimony that most closely matches the goals of the law enforcement community in its broadest context (i.e., federal, state and local) is that used by the financial industry. Risk is defined for financial managers as "the chance that something will come out worse than planned."[3] Finance managers know and plan for risks and hope to avoid the "worse." Police assume the same in terms of risk. They know and plan that crime will occur and hope that the worst does not happen (i.e., their reason for existing); unfortunately the worst crime did occur on September 11, 2001.[4]

The reason for choosing the financial community's definition of risk is because it brings with it a consensus as to what is at stake; that is, monitoring assets, or not losing money. To avoid such risks, one would recognize the value of investing wisely, and where appropriate, to have insurance to cover potential losses.

Similarly in the law enforcement community there is recognition of risk; that is, protection of life and property. While this risk might not be as clearly articulated as it is in the business world, there is the inherent recognition that society needs law enforcement to ensure that crime (hopefully) does not occur. Toward this end, there is a consensus that the goal of law enforcement should be to protect life and property, prevent crime, and apprehend offenders. From my experience, I will offer examples of risk management and how it was effectively used to prevent the worse from happening.

Understanding Risk Management in Law Enforcement

During my time with the New York City Police Department (NYCPD), twelve years were spent within its Inspections Division. This Division was implemented in 1972 in response to the corruption uncovered by the Knapp Commission. Our anti-corruption activities included covert observations of police patrols, inspection of police records, review of crime statistics, and other relevant items that were reflective of the tasks of the unit being observed.

The Inspections Division is responsible for ensuring that all units of the NYCPD were "doing what they were supposed to be doing." While this experience relates more to outcome-based performance monitoring, one example will demonstrate the clear interrelationship between risk management and knowing whether you are accomplishing set goals by implementing outcome-based performance monitoring strategies.

This one example relates to our inspection of patrol vehicles for mandatory equipment. Depending on the location of the precinct, at the minimum each patrol car should have traffic cones; if a highway dissects the precinct, then flares are required; and if a body of water was connected, then a life preserver is also mandatory equipment.

The risks involved are quite clear; that is, if you were to respond to a report of a person drowning, it would be worthwhile to have a life preserver. The reality is that an officer might never encounter the need to save a drowning person, but if the worse did occur and there was no life preserver, the situation could be compounded in that two people might drown (the victim and the officer). Thus, our inspection of these patrol vehicles served to reduce the risk of a worst outcome.

While with the NYCPD and transitioning to a new career as a professor at Pace University, I was awarded a "visiting fellowship" with the National Institute of Justice, the research branch of the U.S. Department of Justice. During this time of 1993 to 1996, my task entailed chairing a planning/advisory group for the 1996 Summer Olympics in Atlanta, Georgia. This group consisted of experts from law enforcement at all levels of government. Our main objective was to assist law enforcement agencies in assessing risks that might be encountered in hosting approximately 2 million people during the 17 days of Olympic events. Several examples will illustrate the simplicity of accomplishing risk management, or in the words of Yogi Berra, "You can observe a lot by watching."

One of the more noteworthy examples involved the City of Conyers (GA) where the Olympic equestrian events were to be held. The city manager, the former chief of police for the City of Conyers, saw the need for his officers to develop insight on how to manage such activities and sent two officers to England; a country known for its history of handling equestrian events.

The lessons learned from their travels were simple: to minimize risks they realized that the crowds for this event were more of a genteel nature and would not require an inordinate amount of security personnel. Personnel were then strategically placed where they might encounter problems, such as, identified locations along the steeplechase route.

Another strategy took place in 1995 where the planning/advisory group attended the Super Bowl to observe how to manage, or move large groups of people. The simple strategy utilized was what is considered a "target hardening" strategy;" that is, to use large planter boxes in rows, strategically placed that would keep the flow of pedestrian traffic going in desired directions. This accomplished the goal of pedestrian movement and gave the added benefit of permitting the crowds to flow about without feeling that they were being directed. This would be an extremely important task if a mass evacuation was needed.

A possible vulnerability was observed on Lake Lanier, the site of the mile-long rowing events. Recognizing the length of this route, it was determined that the cost of fencing in all sides of this route would be costly. To address this risk a decision was again made to strategically place personnel along alternating sides of the lake within view of each other.

The planning for the 1996 Olympics was a success. The one notable exception was the bombing in the "Olympic Park." The original goal was to fence in the Park and permit limited access. However, pressure was exerted to keep the Park open to the citizens of Atlanta, since it was their city hosting the event. An open park obviously increases the risk.

How to Assess Risks in Law Enforcement

There is no magic to managing risks. What is required is a simple agreement from stakeholders as to what the risks are, and what can be done to first hopefully prevent the "worst" from happening, and if not to prevent, to minimize the extent of what might happen. At this point it is important to acknowledge who the stakeholders are.

For the purpose of this discussion, one might hypothesize that if ICE were to assess risks related to its "business," the stakeholders should be chosen from all levels of ICE, and it should also include other government agencies that are impacted by ICE's activities, such as other federal, state and local law enforcement agencies.

Closely related to risk management is the need to measure for results, which will be treated as part of the outcome-based performance monitoring strategies that I will address later. What is important at this point is the recognition of the need for data that will facilitate knowledge on how to avoid risks. For example, data relating to rape occurring on the street at nights has never (not in any of the research I did for NYCPD) disclosed a rape occurring when another person was present. Thus the simple risk avoidance strategy that can be deduced from this is that a woman should always have someone with her during late night hours.

DHS has clearly set the stage and model for recognizing risk management by acknowledging four tasks needed to face the reality of "when" the next attack will occur. To paraphrase their mission statement as it relates to risk management strategies, it would read as follows: hopefully terrorism can be **prevented**; if we are not able to prevent it, then we should be **protected** (e.g., target hardening); and if we are attacked we should have strategies in place that will permit a rapid **response** to minimize the extent of damage and injury; and lastly, we need be able to **recover** as quickly as possible.[5]

As noted above, a major component to developing effective risk assessment requires leadership that recognizes the need for bringing all stakeholders together to jointly assess risks. Carnegie Mellon provides a framework of seven principles to accomplish risk management: global perspective, forward-looking view, open communication, integrated management, continuous process, shared product vision, and teamwork.[6]

While all seven principles might not be appropriate to the public sector, the key elements that an effective leader must facilitate are: open communication, integrated management, a shared vision, teamwork, and recognition that risks assessment is a continuous process. This theme is common throughout the literature on successful organizations, as is captured in the acknowledged book on quality management; that is, *In Search of Excellence*.[7] Excellence requires that everyone be involved and that all tasks be accomplished with excellence as the standard.

A key factor in developing risk assessment is the intricately related development of vision and mission statements. I will address this topic under my discussion of outcome-based performance monitoring strategies. It is important to re-emphasize an agency's vision and mission because this is a major clue as to where to begin one's assessment of risks.

Concerns in Assessing and Managing Risks

There is a significant need for guidance in the public sector concerning implementing risk management strategies; that is, there are a number of concomitant potential negative outcomes brought on by what can best be described as a series of "balancing issues." One definition uncovered for risk management for public officials notes that it "is the process of making and carrying out decisions that will minimize the adverse effects of accidental losses upon a public entity."[8]

As noted earlier, one of the goals of law enforcement is the protection of life and property, which would likely be an issue in dealing with large demonstrations. The risk involved is that if strategies are not employed to control demonstrations, significant damage to life and property can occur as they did in Seattle during the World Economic Forum, or in Oakland (CA) at an anti-war demonstration.

In Oakland the police were warned that "terrorists or self-described terrorist" might disrupt the anti-war demonstration. With the police being on "edge," they fired "wooden dowels, bean bags and rubber pellets," resulting in, "58 people (being) injured." The end result, or risk, was a $2 million settlement with the protestors.[9]

In the context of risk management strategies, the New York City Police Department sought to prevent similar disruptions from occurring. Taking what they believed to be a "proactive" approach, police commanders staged "...'massive amounts' of armored vehicles, prisoner wagons and jail buses in view of the demonstrators,..." (hoping that this) would cause the demonstrators "to be alarmed." They also engaged in what was described as a pre-emptive "seizure of demonstrators on Fifth Avenue who were described as 'obviously potential rioters'", and used "...undercover officers to infiltrate political gathering and monitor behavior," as well as "distribute misinformation within the crowds." [10]

In court documents released as part of a lawsuit, "New York City Police commanders candidly discuss(ed) how they had successfully used 'proactive arrests,' covert surveillance and psychological tactics at political demonstrations ..., and recommend(ed) that those approaches be employed at future gatherings."[11]

The balancing issues are clear in these risk management strategies. The police believe they were successful in preventing risks from occurring, while lawyers for the demonstrators argued that, "the police tactics 'control and curtail the lawful exercise of First Amendment activities'." The lawyer defending the demonstrators stated that the "show of force sent a deliberate warning to people expressing their opinions. 'The message is, if you turn out, be prepared to be arrested, be prepared to be sent away for a long time,...It sounds like something from a battle zone'."[12]

Hoping for the worse not to occur, law enforcement must be prepared to acknowledge and develop strategies to manage risks. Obviously a balancing of multiple issues arises: protecting life and property while ensuring public support of their mission.

Outcome-based Performance Monitoring

To address "outcome-based performance monitoring," one has to define what it is. It is performance measures. It is assessing for whether what you want to achieve is so achieved, such as preventing identified risks. It is outcome measures; it is test results; it is assessment; it is everything that we don't want to be told about ourselves, unless you know you are great and want evidence to prove that you are.

Everyone is in the business of trying to measure things, such as schools "testing whether toddlers in Head Start know their letters or high school students are making progress in reading and math,"[13] as well as my University trying to assess learning outcomes, especially since today students are paying dearly for their college education.

Harry Hatry offers one of the clearest definitions of performance measurement: it is defined as "measurement on a regular basis of the results (outcomes) and efficiency of services or programs."[14] Hatry has added to this definition the need for both public and private agencies not just to measure, but to manage for results;[15]that is, to use the results to make improvements in the organization or in the way it delivers its services.[16]

Besides the obvious reason for outcome based performance monitoring, there is a growing awareness by the general public of the need for better and more responsible government, with citizens now getting attention as "customers." In 1998 one of the first books to address this issue was entitled, *Holding Government Bureaucracies Accountable.*[17] Later in 2000, a poignant book appeared with the title, *Does Your Government Measure Up?: Basic Tools for Local Officials and Citizens.*[18]

How to Conduct Outcome-based Performance Monitoring

Conducting outcome-based performance monitoring is quite simple. In most instances all you need to do is figure out what you want to measure and collect relevant data. For example, if you want to increase police summons activity all you need to do is collect data to show the percentage increase from one period to the next. Unfortunately, this is what many organizations do and in doing just this simple process, they are missing an opportunity to effect major changes. And having a police leader tell the community that they gave out 50 summonses at a location of a rape does little to assure the citizenry that the problem is being addressed.

While I make it sound as if outcome-based performance monitoring strategies is a simple process, the challenge lies in data collection and analysis. Data collection in law enforcement has notoriously been poor. The FBI's efforts to entice some of the more than 19,000 local law enforcement agencies to use NIBRIS (its revised method for defining crimes across jurisdictions), is significantly behind schedule. Lacking a firm data set as offered by NIBRIS, many of the sites that I have visited have crime reports containing minimal data that can be inputted in a records management system for analysis.

The foremost attempt to use data effectively is NYCPD's Compstat strategy.[19] Key in this strategy is a unit within the department that is responsible for "timely and accurate crime reporting" (which is the title of the unit). With this timely and accurate crime data, monthly meetings are held with local precinct commanders, and not only are they expected to be aware of local crime conditions. More importantly, they need to be prepared to explain what they are doing to address them.

I support Hatry's belief that if you use performance measures effectively, you can manage not only for results, but improve the services that the organization provides. I also strongly argue that if performance measures are implemented in the correct way (the correct being that all agree on what is to be measured to achieve the agency's mission), they will also improve the overall morale of all involved: success improves morale, while failure can have the opposite effect. The key to effective use of performance measures and to changing the organization, is good leadership.[20]

One of my many favorite texts on management is entitled *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership*.[21] Its main theme is that when reframing an organization the leader needs to be an artist with a holistic view who intuitively knows the right choice for the organization. If you move to another organization, you should not necessarily bring with you the same choices that you used to reframe your previous one. You need to restart the process each time.

William Bratton, the current chief of the Los Angeles City Police would be my candidate for an artist. To date he has been effective in the various chief positions he has held (Boston Police, NYC Transit Police and NYCPD). One of the strategies that he uses is what I, and a colleague at Pace University (Dr. Joseph Pastore, professor of management), would label as a "walkabout manager."

A walkabout manager does not limit presence to headquarters, rather it requires (in this instance) visits to precinct station houses and greet line officers. The net result of this is that the officers feel the leader cares about them and that he is one of them. At the end of the day they go home and tell their families that "the chief came out to see us." If you want people to follow you and help you achieve your goals, you need to get their buy-in.

One of the most important strategies that a leader needs upon assuming a command position is to find the agency's vision and mission statement. This statement will tell you what the organization hopes to accomplish and where it should be heading. If there is no vision and mission statement, then it is imperative that one is developed. Without this tool, your agency is going to miss the opportunities to recognize risks and fail to achieve its outcomes.

A vision is view of where you are going, and the mission tells you how you are going to get there. Experience has shown that poor managers are the ones who "plunge into a minefield without knowing where the explosives (i.e., in this instance the "risks") are buried—they launch new initiatives with little or no effort to map the fields."[22] As Bolman and Deal note, "Effective leaders help establish a vision, set standards for performance and create focus and direction for collective efforts."[23] They concluded that

> One of the most powerful ways in which leaders can interpret experience is by distilling and disseminating a vision—a persuasive and hopeful image of the future. A vision needs to address both the challenges of the present and the hopes and values of followers. Vision is particularly important in times of crisis and uncertainty.[24]

September 11, 2001 changed the way law enforcement needs to operate. We are in a time of crisis and uncertainty. Leadership at this time in ICE is imperative. I can only assume that the GAO Report and these hearings are focused on assisting ICE improve its delivery of service to enhance its strategy in ensuring national security.

In my travels to various police agencies during my evaluation of the COPS Program,[25] I encountered one agency that had implemented a vision and mission statement: the San Diego Police Department. SDPD's vision and mission statement was developed using a number of focus group meetings hosted by an outside consulting agency and involved all key stakeholders, in this instance, it included members of the community, other government organizations, patrol officers and command staff. Once the vision and mission statement was formulated, every officer and staff member was given a pocket size laminated card and a copy was also conspicuously posted in each police facility. A copy of their vision and mission statement is on their web site and is attached to this testimony (see Appendix A).

Upon our follow-up visit two years later to the SDPD, we asked the chief if they were still using their vision and mission statement, and if so, was it still relevant. The chief's response was that not only were they using it, they brought back the outside consultant agency to reconvene the focus group meetings to see if the two year old statement was still current to the changing needs of their community. All in the agency agreed that it was still applicable and that they will continue to revisit it every two years. In the words of the police chief, "a vision and mission statement is a living view of where they need to be heading."

The example set by the San Diego Police Department embodies the essence of text that I mentioned earlier, which is more than 20 years old, yet as relevant today as it was in 1982. *In Search of Excellence: Lessons Learned from America's Best-Run Companies,*[26] argued that it is the changing and improving of small things and controlling for the constant smooth running of them that will lead to bigger changes.

When implementing community policing strategies in New York City in 1984, we encouraged officers to tackle "small wins." We knew that they were not going to reduce crime overnight, but they could accomplish small tasks such as organizing a community to clean up littered lots. This strategy was also seen in various police agencies that I visited around the country when they, too, began

implementing community policing.[27] It is the small things that matter and lead to major changes.[28]

One of the key strategies that Bill Bratton pioneered when he became the chief of the NYC Transit Police was to have officers focus on minor crimes, such as fare-beaters and graffiti artists. These minor arrests resulted in defendants being arrested and found to be in possession of dangerous weapons, weapons that more than likely were to be used in committing more serious crimes.[29] In this instance Bratton became the vision creator,[30] and in turn significantly achieved his goal of reducing crime in the NYC transit system.

A common difficulty that is encountered in law enforcement is the inability to capture comparable data. I live in a county in New York State with 43 separate police agencies, which is also served by a county police department and by the state police. When I asked one of my graduate students to conduct a comparison analysis[31] of his police agency with two or three other communities, he was unable to find any that had similar data points of information (e.g., they had a different definition of burglary or auto thefts, and some information was collected by the state police in a completely different format).

When data is lacking and an agency finds itself in a unique position of not finding data that is comparable, a useful strategy is called benchmarking.[32] One benchmarking strategy is to find a similar agency that is attempting to accomplish similar goals. In this instance one might suggest that ICE could find another government agency that employs investigative strategies and examine/compare how success is measured.

Concerns in Conducting Outcome-based Performance Monitoring

No one likes to be assessed. In my experience with NYCPD, successful outcomes from an evaluation would likely lead to promotion, and obviously the other side is demotion and or loss of a command. This fear results in resistance. It was not uncommon when our covert observations were uncovered to be pulled over by a police patrol unit with flashing lights asking for us to identify ourselves. Once identified, the officers would alert their colleagues of our presence over the radio.

It is no longer an issue of whether outcome-based performance monitoring should be conducted. We are now living in a time when citizens as customers expect government agencies to deliver services for which they are paying. "Increased taxation without services" will be the crying call. In one police agency in my county where the police did not get along with the community, the town board voted no funding for the police department, and in 1999 effectively shut the police department down. The community simply turned to services they had been paying for in addition to the local police, that is, the county and state police.

Another factor that plays into the need for not only outcome-based performance monitoring, but for risk assessment is the issue of civil liability. Lawsuits against police have risen significantly over the years. In the period of 1967 to 1971, lawsuits increased 124%, many of them for poor police practices.[33]

The key to overcoming resistance and effecting change is how you develop your vision and mission statement. It is important that "you ... engage the people most likely to be affected—the ones who are already involved and who have the most at stake in getting the job done right. You have to seek their advice and give them the power to fix what they—more than anyone else—know needs fixing."[34]

Another important key to effecting change is once the vision and mission statements have been developed, the information needs to be shared with all (as it was with the San Diego Police Department), and training needs to be implemented that will provide insight to all as to how the tasks will be accomplished.

Recommendations

In offering recommendations it is important to note again that I was not given access to the GAO Report concerning ICE, therefore, I am not aware of the structural problems faced by this agency, nor of the recommendations that GAO offered. My recommendations will therefore be ones that I strongly believe can be adopted by any government or private agency that wants to effectively deploy its resources, especially in this instance, to enhance national security.

1. ICE should hire an outside consultant to help them develop a vision and mission statement for their agency. In doing so it is important that key stakeholders be identified and involved in the discussion as to ICE's vision and mission; that is, what ICE should be accomplishing and how it should be accomplished.

2. Similar to the SDPD, once this vision and mission statement is formulated, it should be shared with all in ICE and training should be developed that will provide insight on how goals will be achieved.

3. Once a consensus is developed for ICE's vision and mission, key stakeholders within ICE should begin to assess risks they face. The stakeholders need to include representatives from all levels of the agency, from front line members to command and senior staff.

4. Outcome-based performance monitoring system should be developed that parallels the vision and mission statement in an effort to ensure that they are achieving agreed upon goals.

5. ICE should identify key data elements that can be used as part of its outcome-based performance monitoring strategies and which can be used to improve the use of resources needed to ensure national security.

Thank you for listening to my testimony.

Endnotes

[1] Swell Chan, "Los Angeles Mayor Sees Bloomberg School Reforms as Model," *New York Times*, March 21, 2006.
[2] Carnegie Mellon, Software Engineering Institute. *Risk Management.* http://www.Sei.cmu.edu/risk/index.html.
[3] Frank M. Werner and James A. F. Stoner, *Modern Financial Managing: Continuity and Change*, 3rd ed. (St Paul, MN: Freeload Press, 2006).
[4] Thomas H. Keane, *The 911 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission On Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States*. Authorized Edition, 2005.
[5] http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/
[6] See note 3 above.
[7] Thomas Peters and Robert H. Waterman Jr. *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies* (New York: Harper and Row, 1982).
[8] Richard A. Furst, "Basics of Risk Management for Public Officials," *Municipal Maryland*, January 2006, 14:16.
[9] Carolyn Marshall, "Oakland Nears Final Payout For Protestors Hurt by Police," *New York Times*, March 20, 2006, Late edition.
[10] Jim Dyer, "Police Memos Say Arrest Tactics Calmed Protest," *New York Times*, March 17, 2006, A1.
[11] Ibid.
[12] Ibid.
[13] Karen W. Arenson, "Testing Errors Prompt Calls for Oversight," *New York Times*, March 18, 2006, A1.
[14] Harry P. Hatry, *Performance Measurement: Getting Results* (Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press, 1999). 3.
[15] Ibid, *Public and Private Agencies Need to Manage for Results, Not Just Measure Them.* http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=900731
[16] Elaine Morley, Scott P. Bryant and Harry P. Hatry, *Comparative Performance Measurement* (Washington, D.C. Urban Institute Press, 1999), xi.
[17] Rosen, Bernard. *Holding Government Bureaucracies Accountable.* (Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1998).
[18] William D. Coplin and Carol Dwyer, *Does Your Government Measure Up?: Basic Tools for Local Officials and Citizens* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2000)
[19] Vincent E. Henry, *The Compstat Paradigm: Management Accountability in Policing, Business and the Public Sector* (New York: Looseleaf Law Publications, 2002).
[20] William Bratton and Peter Knobler, *Turnaround: How America's Top Cop Reversed the Crime Epidemic* (New York: Random House, 1998), and M. R. Haberfeld, *Police Leadership* (New Jersey: Pearson, 2006).
[21] Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal. *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997).
[22] Ibid. 181.
[23] Ibid. 297.
[24] Ibid. 315.
[25] Jeffrey A. Roth and Joseph F. Ryan, *National Evaluation of the COPS Program* (Washington, D.C. National Institute of Justice, August 2000).
[26] Peters and Waterman, *In Search of Excellence.*
[27] Joseph F. Ryan, "Community Policing: Trends, Policies, Programs and Definition," *Critical Issues in Crime and Justice*, ed. Albert Roberts (Ohio: Sage Publications, 1994). 127-144.
[28] Bratton and Knobler, *Turnaround:.*
[29] Ibid.
[30] Paul Hersey, Kenneth H. Blanchard and Dewey E. Johnson. *Management of Organizational Behavior* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1996).
[31] Elaine Morley, Scott P. Bryant and Harry P. Hatry. *Comparative Performance Measurement* (Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press).
[32] Patricia Keehley, et al, *Benchmarking for Best Practices in the Public Sector: Achieving Performance Breakthroughs in Federal, State and Local Agencies* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997).

[33] Victor Kappeler, *Critical Issues in Police Civil Liability* (Illinois, Waveland Press, 1997).

[34] National Performance Review, *Common Sense Government: Work Better and Costs Less* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995). 1.

Bibliography

Arenson, Karen W. "Testing Errors Prompt Calls for Oversight," *New York Times,* March 18, 2006, Late Edition.

Beam, George. *Quality Public Management: What It Is and How It Can Be Improved and Advanced.* Chicago: Burnham Inc., Publishers, 2001.

Bolman, Lee G. and Terrence E. Deal. *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Bratton, William, and Peter Knobler. *Turnaround: How America's Top Cop Reversed the Crime Epidemic*. New York: Random House, 1998.

Carnegie Mellon, Software Engineering Institute. *Risk Management*. http://www.Sei.cmu.edu/risk/index.html.

Chan, Sewell. "Los Angeles Mayor See Bloomberg School Reforms as Model," *New York Times*, March 21, 2006.

Cohen, Steven and William Eimicke. *Tools for Innovators: Creative Strategies for Managing Public Sector Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.

Cooper, Terry L. *The Responsible Administrator: An Approach to Ethics for the Administrative Role*, 4th Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.

Conklin, John E. *Why Crime Rates Fell*. Boston: Pearson Education, 2003.

Coplin, William D., and Carol Dwyer. *Does Your Government Measure Up?: Basic Tools for Local Officials and Citizens*. New York: Syracuse University Press, 2000.

Cordner, Gary W., and Donna C. Hale. *What works in Policing?: Operations and Administration Examined*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Press, 1992.

Cordner, Gary W., Kathryn E. Scarborough and Robert Sheehan. *Police Administration*. 5th Edition. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson/Lexis Nexus Group, 2004

Denhardt, Robert B., and Janet Vinzant Denhardt and Maria P. Aristigueta. *Managing Human Behavior in Public and Nonprofit Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 2002.

Dyer, Jim, "Police Memos Say Arrest Tactics Calmed Protest," *New York Times*, March 17, 2006.

Furst, Richard A. "Basics of Risk Management for Public Officials," *Municipal Maryland*, January 2006.

Goldstein, Herman. *Problem-Oriented Policing*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.

Goodsell, Charles, *The Case for Bureaucracy*, 3rd edition. Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House, 1994.

Guyot, Dorothy. *Policing As Though People Matter.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991.

Haberfeld, M.R. *Police Leadership*. New Jersey: Pearson, 2006

Hatry, Harry P. *Performance Measurement: Getting Results*. Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press, 1999.

Henry, Vincent E. *The Compstat Paradigm: Management Acccountability in Policing, Business and the Public Sector.* New York: Looseleaf Law Publications, 2002

Hersey, Paul, Kenneth H. Blanchard and Dewey E. Johnson. *Management of Organizational Behavior.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1996.

Kappeler, Victor. *Critical Issues in Police Civil Liability.* Illinois, Waveland Press, 1997.

Thomas H. Keane, *The 911 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission On Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States*. Authorized Edition, 2005.

Keehley, Patricia, Steven Medlin, Sue McBride and Laura Longmire. *Benchmarking for Best Practices in the Public Sector: Achieving Performance Breakthroughs in Federal, State and Local Agencies.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1997.

Knapp, Whitman. *Knapp Commission Report*. 1972.

Lipsky, Michael, *Street Level Bureaucracy*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1980.

Marshall, Carolyn, "Oakland Nears Final Payout For Protestors Hurt by Police," *New York Times*, March 20, 2006, Late edition.

Mnookin, Robert H., Scott R. Peppet and Andrew S. Tulumello. *Beyond Winning: Negotiating to Create Value in Deals and Disputes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000

Morgan, Gareth, *Images of Organizations*, Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1997.

Morley, Elaine, Scott P. Bryant and Harry P. Hatry. *Comparative Performance Measurement.* Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute Press.

National Peformance Review, *Common Sense Government: Work Better and Costs Less.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995.

___. *Putting Customers First '95: Standards for Serving the American People.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1995.

Osborne, David and Ted Gaebler. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector.* New York: Plume/Penguin, 1992.

Pasmore, William A. *Creating Strategic Change: Designing the Flexible, High-Performing Organization*. New York: John Wiley, 1994.

Peters, Thomas J., and Robert H. Waterman Jr. *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies*. New York: Harper and Row, 1982.

Popovich, Mark G. *Creating High-Performance Government Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.

Rosen, Bernard. *Holding Government Bureaucracies Accountable.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 1998.

Roth, Jeffrey A., and Ryan, Joseph F. *National Evaluation of the COPS Program*, Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, August 2000.

Ryan, Joseph F. "Community Policing: Trends, Policies, Programs and Definition," *Critical Issues in Crime and Justice*, ed. Albert Roberts. Ohio: Sage Publications, 1994.

Taylor, Frederick W., "Scientific Management", in *Classics of Public Administration*, ed. Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde Illinois: Moore Publishing Co., Inc., 1978).

Thibault, Edward A., Lawrence M. Lynch, and Bruce R. McBride. *Proactive Police Management*, 6th Edition. New Jersey: Pearson, 2004.

Werner, Frank M., and James A. F. Stoner, *Modern Financial Managing: Continuity and Change*, 3rd Edition. St Paul, MN: Freeload Press, 2006.

Wholey, Joseph S., Harry P. Hatry, and Kathryn E. Newcomer, eds. *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass,1994.

APPENDIX A

San Diego Police Department
Vision and Mission Statement

Mission Statement

Vision

We are committed to working together, within the Department, in a problem solving partnership with communities, government agencies, private groups and individuals to fight crime and improve the quality of life for the people of San Diego.

Values

The principles upon which we base our policing are:

Human Life - The protection of human life is our highest priority.

Ethics - We will demonstrate integrity and honor in all our actions.

Crime Fighting - Our efforts to address neighborhood problems will be based on a Partnership with the community.

Valuing People - We will treat each other with dignity and respect, protecting the rights and well-being of all individuals.

Loyalty - We will be loyal to the community, to the department and its members, and to the standards of our profession.

Open Communication - We will listen to one another's opinions and concerns.

Fairness - Our decisions will be based on common sense, and will be balanced, moral, legal, and without personal favoritism.

Diversity - We appreciate one another's differences and recognize that our unique skills, knowledge, abilities and backgrounds bring strength and caring to our organization.

Mission

Our mission is to maintain peace and order by providing the highest quality police services in response to community needs by:

Apprehending Criminals

Developing Partnerships

Respecting Individuals

| Police Department Home Page | Help Us Help You | In Your Neighborhood | Forms | Top of Page |
| Crime Prevention & Education | Crime Statistics/Maps | About SDPD | Join the SDPD |

| Home | Business | City Hall | Community | Departments | Information | Leisure | Services A-Z | Visiting |
| Search | Site Map | Contact the City | Privacy Notice | Disclaimers |